

A Warning Signal The Peace Movement Ought to Heed While There's Still Time

"There is no doubt that the stakes are high in Vietnam. They are considerably more important than the economic, political and strategic value of the country. For in Vietnam the U.S. has fielded for the first time its concept of 'counter-insurgency'. . . . Because the U.S. has been morally, militarily and politically committed in South Vietnam, because its prestige is involved and because the conse-

quences of failure would have world-wide repercussions, most, but not all, Washington officials believe the price of victory must be paid even if the price includes some limited commitment of U.S. combat forces. . . . Victory, no matter what is done, is far away."

—Hanson W. Baldwin, No. 1 U.S. military writer and trusted Pentagon confidant, in the *New York Times* Feb. 16.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 8

FEBRUARY 24, 1964



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Outlook for Civil Rights in The Senate

A most hopeful augury the day the Civil Rights bill made its debut in the Senate was the remark by Republican Leader Dirksen that the accommodations section was "much more acceptable" to him than the original version. This looks like the beginning of a climb-down which would put the GOP leadership in the Senate as solidly behind the bill as it was in the House. There is hope in the air. The civil rights forces emerged from the fight in the House with increased confidence in themselves and a new respect for President Johnson. The Leadership Conference, with the help of the labor movement, probably did the best organized job of lobbying ever seen on Capitol Hill. There was a system of "spotters" in the gallery to watch the teller votes closely and to bring up votes quickly from a network of whips organized by the Democratic Study Group. There was an informal whip system by the civil rights forces themselves on each floor of the House office buildings to notify members of the votes coming up. One Congressman was even hailed, protesting, out of a "hot" poker game to do his bit in history. In place of indiscriminate "marches", hundreds of selected people with influence were brought in, including one Negro oil millionaire from the Southwest. The AFL-CIO itself marshalled a hundred or more key labor people.

A New Faith In LBJ

The most extraordinary part of the whole affair is the trust President Johnson has won in a few short months from Negro, labor and liberal leaders strongly opposed to him in the past. Leadership Conference spokesmen, in discussing the atmosphere in the House, said the Democrats "knew he meant business." They praise the quality of the White House liaison with the Hill during the fight, and the close and effective support given by the Justice Department. Mr. Johnson's hand was credited when ten Texans signed the discharge petition. Four—Brooks, Gonzales, Pickle, and Thomas—even voted for the bill. Chairman Emanuel Celler of House Judiciary piloted the bill with a patience, skill and fortitude that added another wonderful chapter to this old Gibraltar's record in the House. McCulloch of Ohio, the ranking Republican on Judiciary, from a district with few Negroes, won the gratitude of the civil rights forces by the way he led the Republican wing of the victorious coalition. Corman (Cal) and Rodino (NJ) on the Democratic and Lindsay

A Christian View of Cuba

"The American blockade of Cuba is morally reprehensible, pragmatically futile and politically disastrous. . . . The time has come to abandon the un-American, unChristian and anti-human doctrine that what is ultimate in international relations and the shaping of history is physical power, material wealth and the relentless pursuit of self-interest. . . . The hour has arrived when Fidel Castro should be afforded the opportunity, hitherto denied him, to expound his position and to negotiate the issues that vitiate relations between Cuba and the United States. Failure to achieve such encounter will darken the horizons of the western hemisphere and of the world. On the matter of our relations with Cuba, Christians and Christian churches dare no longer remain silent."

—*The Christian Century: Return to Cuba* by Dr. John A. Mackay, president emeritus, Princeton Theological Seminary, Feb. 12.

(NY) and Mathias (Md) on the Republican side were able and devoted lieutenants. In the fight over amendments designed to weaken by widening the bill, Mrs. Green of Oregon stood alone among the women members in opposing a spurious "women's rights" amendment and that grand old man, Barrett O'Hara, fought off an equally spurious amendment to protect the aged. Best of all was the fact that so little racism appeared in the debate; Jones of Missouri was the worst in this respect. "The day of the old Southern demagogue," said one Leadership spokesman, "seems to be over."

The Senate is, of course, a far grimmer obstacle than the House, but the civil rights forces go into the fight there with a strange feeling which might best be described as a lingering distrust of their own optimism. The Southerners undoubtedly have some tricks up their sleeves; but so do the civil rights forces. Even as the House bill reached the Senate floor, a draft was circulating among friendly Senators which would add two new titles to the bill. These, if sponsored by liberal Republicans, would raise the ante with the Democrats and provide new pressure on the leadership. They offer, at the least, something to swap in a bargain and at the most the threat to the South of a much stronger bill should some new outrage suddenly change the picture as the Birmingham

(Continued on Page Four)

Gore Tried to Raise Exemptions at the Bottom Instead of Profits at The Top

The War on Poverty Starts Off With A Tax Bill "To Make the Rich Richer"

The tax bill is a measure of the Administration's "unconditional war on poverty." The Senate tax debate was the logical place to begin the battle, but became the scene instead of an unconditional surrender to the rich. "The majority of our people," Gruening (*D. Ala*) told the Senate in the finishing stages Feb. 5, "having heard so long of, and waited so long for, tax relief, will wonder where it is. To paraphrase Winston Churchill, it might be said that never will so many have waited so long for so much and received so little. This will not be true of the affluent minority."

The day he spoke the *New York Times* reported that more American corporations made more money in 1963 than in any year in business history. The combined net income of 150 companies was up 11.0% from 1962; General Motors reported the largest profit ever made by a U.S. company, more than \$1.5 billions. To pass a tax bill cutting corporate and high bracket income taxes in the face of such a record was a steal. That the labor movement went along only demonstrates the feeble fat in its leadership. Gruening called this a bill "to make the rich richer."

False Forecast and Fallacious Theory

The tax bill was predicated upon a false prediction and a fallacious theory. The prediction, 18 months ago, when the tax bill was launched, foresaw a recession in 1964. The bill was supposed to insure against this. But as Gore (*D. Tenn*) told the Senate Feb. 4, employment, production, profits and dividends are at an all-time high. The theory is that the way to deal with a recession and with the problem of the impoverished "lower fifth" of our society is to make business more profitable by tax cuts and special tax privileges. These are the remedies which have been applied since the tax revision of 1954. The result has been to speed up investment at public expense in labor saving devices—and add to unemployment. "Almost 1 million more people were employed in our factories 7 years ago," Gore told the Senate, "than are employed today."

The tax structure could be used in one of two ways to fight poverty. One would be not only to retain high tax rates on the record profits of U.S. industry but close the loopholes which make these rates illusory—and then spend the extra revenue on the special measures required to deal with the "lower fifth"—education, housing, slum clearance, better hospitals, retraining, and large scale public development of

Poets Need It More Than Oil Men

PROXMIRE (D. Wis.): The argument is made that the depletion allowance is necessary because this is a high risk industry. Is it not correct that Dun's Review shows that the construction industry has failures in the neighborhood of 86 per 10,000, the retail industry has failures of 400 per 10,000. . . . How many failures are there in the petroleum industry?

DOUGLAS (D., Ill.): Four out of every 10,000.

PROXMIRE: Four out of every ten thousand?

DOUGLAS: Yes. It is the lowest of any industrial group. It is one of the safest industries to go into. The ratio is 20 in food and 86 in construction, but only 4 in oil, gas, and mining. If these people claim we must give them a tax break, what are we going to do for the corner grocer? What about poets? Should not poetic genius have a depletion allowance? Should not there be a depletion allowance for defeated politicians?

—In the Senate tax debate, Feb. 6.

national slums like Appalachia.

The other way would be to raise individual income tax exemptions to end what Senator Gore called "the taxation of poverty." These exemptions are unfairly low. In 1940 a man and his wife had a personal exemption of \$2,000. "Now the cost of living is more than twice as much as it was in 1940," Gore protested, "and the exemption is down to \$1,200." He proposed to restore the \$1,000 per person exemption as a substitute for the corporate and individual rate reductions in the tax bill. This would give real relief to the "lower fifth"—how do you raise a child nowadays on \$600 a year?—and stimulate consumer buying.

This would raise the standard of living at the bottom of society instead of raising the rate of profit at the top. But Henry Ford 2nd and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have not been campaigning for *that* kind of a tax cut. Gore's proposal was rejected on a voice vote. Then he suggested raising the tax exemption from \$600 a year to \$800. This was defeated 61-to-33 on a motion to table. But the idea of not taxing poverty should reverberate. Higher exemptions at the bottom plus repeal of excise taxes should be the target of labor and the progressives. This tax bill is a scandal, likely only to set off stock market speculation and inflation. Inflation in its turn will again tax the poor and fixed incomes for the benefit of great wealth. They get the poor coming and going.

From Medicine Hat to Dar-es-Salaam, When Anything Goes Wrong

"I had thought that the classic manifestation of humbug, the effort to merchandise our errors and omissions as the machinations of the Communists went out approximately with Harold Talbot. But . . . in the last few days, in the person of Castro, Communists have become responsible for everything that has gone wrong from Medicine Hat to Dar-es-Salaam."

"For years, diligent public servants have tried to do something about Panama. There they have encountered a backward social structure and the revelation of some American residents that they were another chosen people. Here at home, they have encountered the conviction that, unlike the repressive colonialism of the British or the French, our needs in other countries are sanctified both by high strategy

and the peculiar charity of our hearts.

"Given these difficulties, there was much to forgive in the recent crisis. But the prompt and wonderfully reminiscent statement from the foreign policy establishment that it was mostly the fault of the Communists should have been greeted with public hilarity.

"We can all be persuaded that Fidelistas were around. We might even be willing to assume that there was a certified, registered, insured, prepaid, cooperative (and remarkably foresighted) plot. Even then the first thought of an American official should have been: 'Won't the American people ask who gave them their chance?'"

—Former Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith at a Washington Post Book lunch, *Con. Record*, Feb. 4, p. 1744.

A Speech The Press Ignored: Warning Against Becoming "Policeman to The World"**Morse Declares That the Place for the Cyprus Issue Is In the UN****By Senator Wayne Morse ***

The official American position that Cyprus is a NATO problem does not, in my opinion, withstand analysis. Cyprus is not a member of NATO. The only NATO problem there is the possibility of rising rivalry between Greece and Turkey as a result of the conflict. That is the only place where it can be said with any justification that NATO should deal with the issue and not the United Nations.

Other NATO Powers Reluctant

But even there, NATO consists of a lot more than just Britain and the United States. If any action is needed to keep Greece and Turkey from getting involved directly, that action should be taken by the entire North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and not by the United States and Britain acting in the guise of NATO. France has already made perfectly clear, as a member of NATO, that she will have none of it. Let the State Department tell the American people how many other NATO countries look with great reservation in regard to NATO intervention in Cyprus. The proper place for the Cypriot issue is in the United Nations. How can we condemn France and the Soviet Union for circumventing and ignoring the United Nations at their convenience, when we do the same thing?

I am at a loss to understand what the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, is doing in London, much less flying to Cyprus for. It is perfectly obvious what the British want. They want the United States to pick up the check for the failure of the British Government in Cyprus. The British Government has been attempting to run out on its responsibilities in instance after instance, as its colonial policies go down the drain around the world, and looks to the United States to pick up the check.

I am alarmed at the policy of the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, who are apparently laboring under the illusion that the United States

*Abridged from a speech to the U.S. Senate, Feb. 10.

Is Criticism of Bonn Verboten at NATO?

MR. WARBEY (Lab.) asked why the speech of M. Spaak at the NATO Council meeting last December had been classified as a secret document.

MR. MATHEW (Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs—Proceedings in the North Atlantic Council are confidential and all records of them are classified.

MR. WARBEY—At a press conference following the meeting the NATO press officer was very willing to give full accounts of speeches made by the Foreign Secretary and other Foreign Ministers, but refused to make any comment on the speech made by M. Spaak. Was this because M. Spaak expressed concern at the veto placed by the West German Government on an approach towards the Soviet Union to reach a peaceful settlement in Europe?

MR. MATHEW—I do not propose to be drawn into breaking this rule of confidence.

—House of Commons, Feb. 10 (London Times).

can step in and take the place of all the former colonial powers in the trouble spots of the world. Of course, they will try to get American boys into Cyprus.

NATO is no longer what it is "cracked up" to be. In my judgment, NATO is rapidly becoming a great liability for the United States, and this move of the British is the latest in the attempt of some of our NATO allies who have not lived up to their NATO commitments to get the United States to assume a burden which is beyond all equity.

If we believe in the United Nations and call on other nations to respect it, we must believe in it and respect it ourselves. We are not doing that when we try to keep the Cyprus problem out of the U.N. We know what happened with regard to the attitude of France, Belgium, and the Soviet Union in regard to the Congo. They walked out on their obligations under the United Nations charter. I do not want to see my country make the same mistake.

If the United States allows itself to be made the policeman of the world, we are going to end up just as Great Britain ended up—dead broke.

Sen. Pell's Plea for An End to Our Stale German Policy Reaches the SEP

"Since the late 1940's our policy on Germany has been frozen. We have insisted on early reunification through free elections. We have insisted that Communist East Germany does not exist. We have insisted that East Germany and East Berlin are the Soviet areas of a four-power military occupation, and that our rights are based on occupation agreements which are almost 20 years old. This policy simply does not fit the facts of today.

"We based our original support of a reunified Germany on the assumption that such a Germany would be neutral. If Germany were somehow to be reunified today, the result would be a military colossus. The very idea worries our West European allies and sends shivers up the spines of the East Europeans. It is high time for us to face the impossibility of a peacefully unified and armed Germany in the near future. Yet, these thoughts are rarely uttered in public. Why? Because, as so often happens in democracies, we become frozen into positions that relate more to the past than present. Any suggestion of a change sounds almost un-American.

"We should initiate policies which will not only improve conditions for all of Berlin and Germany but lead to a relaxing of tensions in central Europe. The most important single concession we must gain is absolute freedom of access to Berlin. Officially, we claim we already have these rights. But, as repeated crises on the highway show, they are constantly open to challenge. What I propose is that our rights of access be completely spelled out and that the main highway be declared an international territory subject to no controls of any kind.

"What can we offer in exchange? I believe we should offer to accept the Oder-Neisse boundary; for another, I believe we should grant de facto recognition to the Government of East Germany. Is this too much to offer in return for guarantees of a right we claim we already hold? I think not. We would simply be recognizing realities that presently exist."

—Sen. Claiborne Pell, (D. R.I.) "Berlin: Let's Stop Courting Disaster," *Saturday Evening Post*, Feb. 8 (abr.).

There Are Many Ways to Wear Down and Defeat A Filibuster

(Continued from Page One)

church bombings did last year in the House. One new title would tighten up the police brutality section of existing civil rights law, make communities and counties liable to suit for the actions of their officers and establish a new civil rights police to take the place of the FBI in this area of enforcement. The other title would tighten up voting provisions by making the orders of Federal registrars directly enforceable, giving the Civil Rights Commission power to issue cease-and-desist orders against interference with voting and empower the Commission to void elections where the right to vote of certified voters was denied. It would also provide for immediate steps to cut down the South's representation in Congress under the 2d section of the 14th Amendment.

Surprise Tactics Expected

The tactics on the floor are also likely to provide surprises. Mansfield, smarting under unfavorable comparisons between his leadership and Johnson's, has appointed four able and uncompromising Senators to manage the fight for the bill: Humphrey, Magnuson, Clark and Hart. Mansfield himself opened debate the first day with an eloquence which matched the great occasion. In his appeal for the Senate to act he said the fundamental issue raised by the bill "will involve all Americans and all the institutions, public and private, which hold us as a society of diversity in one nation, and it will involve all for a long time to come. In truth, it is a universal issue which, for this nation, having begun with the Declaration of Independence and persisted through the decades, will hardly dissolve in the Senate of the 88th Congress." The rhetoric was not too lofty for the first page of what we all hope will be a close-to-final chapter in the American Negro's struggle for full emancipation. But Mansfield's real test will be more arduous than the achievement of style. He must demonstrate a new militancy. There are many ways, short of round-the-clock sessions, by which a firm majority under tough leadership can hold the reins on a filibustering minority. And perhaps win the fight without resort to cloture, which might entail serious compromise. The rules are being studied as never before. A majority of 51 by the use of the motion to table, which is not debatable, can block time-

That's Jefferson Turning In His Grave

Two amendments to the Civil Rights bill which indicate how far we have drifted from the principles of a free society were accepted by the House. One would bar atheists and the other Communists from utilizing Title VII which guarantees equal employment opportunity. The Rev. Kenneth Marshall, a Unitarian Minister in Washington, was quick to point out in a sermon that the atheist amendment would have made second class citizens of Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Tom Paine, Robert Ingersoll, Thomas Edison and Albert Einstein, none of whom were religious in the conventional sense. Holifield (D. Cal) courageously opposed this amendment on the floor Feb. 8 and was supported by Rodino (D N.J.), Joelson (D. N.J.), Ryan (D. N.Y.) and Roberts (D. Tex.) but it passed 137-98 over the angry protest of Chairman Celler. It takes nerve nowadays to uphold the right to disbelieve in God. It takes even more nerve to uphold the right to be a Communist. When the companion amendment (by Colmer of Mississippi) to bar Communists from using the FEPC came up on Feb. 10 Celler cast doubt on its constitutionality but no one spoke against it. "If we oppose this amendment," Roosevelt (D. Cal) said bravely, "it would put you in company with Communists or pro-Communists. I do not think any member should be put in that light. I believe in the patriotism of every member of this House." A consistent belief in the First Amendment is by this standard unpatriotic. These provisions may yet be used against Negroes in those areas where militancy is easily equated with atheism and communism.

consuming amendments. A skillful use of the "morning hour" can cut down the ambit of the filibuster. There are other, rarely used weapons, available to a presiding officer prepared to be strict and ruthless. Best of all, several months of old-fashioned white supremacist ranting from the Southern die-hards, blocking all other public business, and making the U.S. look foolish in the eyes of the world, may generate so derisive and impatient a storm from the country as to force cloture without compromise. The South knows itself defeated; it feels a new era is just around the corner. Men like Russell already belong to the past. They could not find a more graceful opportunity to lose than now, with a Southerner in the White House.

Free Copies Still Available of Matthews Cuba Issue If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly		5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
		Washington 15, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:		
Name		
Street		
City	Zone.....	State.....
2/24/64		
Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:		
(To) Name		
Street		
City	Zone.....	State.....
Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐		

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Newspaper

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.